

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/625,863	Applicant(s) PHILLIPS ET AL.	
	Examiner ROBERT C. SCHEIBEL	Art Unit 2619	

All Participants:

(1) ROBERT C. SCHEIBEL

(2) Tadd F. Wilson (Reg. No. 54,544)

Date of Interview: 11 June 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

The proposed rejections using one or both of the references listed below

Claims discussed:

1 and 10

Prior art documents discussed:

US 2004/0170268 to Hakusui and US 2002/0172345 to Wu

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 4:00 EDT

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner initiated the interview to clarify a few claim limitations that didn't appear to have support in the specification. Applicant provided the intended meaning of these limitations (as indicated below). Examiner will object to these limitations in the forthcoming office action and treat the claims using the intended language discussed in this interview.

Further, Examiner discussed the Hokusui and Wu references and the proposed rejections using these references. After some discussion on how to amend the claims to make them allowable, Examiner and Applicant agreed that an office action should be issued and the Applicant may contact Examiner with proposed claim language after considering the references in more detail.

Regarding the clarified claim language:

Claim 1 indicates "a demarcation device coupled to the first and second communication channels and interposed between the first and second communication channels and the one or more wired phones at the user location". This language is not supported in the specification. However, Applicant indicated that the intention was to indicate that the demarcation device is coupled to the first and second communication channels and is interposed between both (a) the first and second communication channels and (b) the first communication channel and the one or more wired phones at the user location. As indicated above, Examiner will give the claim language the above meaning in the forthcoming office action.

In claim 10, the third step indicates that the incoming phone call is routed to "a wireless interface coupled to one or more wired phones at a user location". However, there is no support in the specification for this limitation. The specification has wireless interfaces for wireless phones and wired interfaces for wired phones. Applicant indicated that the limitation was likely intended to mean either the wireless interface(s) to the cordless phones and/or wireless SIP phones or the wired interfaces to the SIP phones and/or POTS phones. The forthcoming office action will use one of these interpretations and object to the claim language so that it is corrected in the next response.